

REMARKS

Claims 1-37 are pending in this application. Claims 5 and 6 have been canceled without prejudice and claims 1, 7, 8 and 26 have been amended in response to the instant office action. No new matter is added by the amendments to claims 1, 7, 8 and 26.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2006/0109388 ("Sanders"); and (2) claims 1-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2006/0148575 ("Vitito").

Rejection Based on Vitito

Applicant submits that Vitito is not prior art to the claims of the instant application. The instant application was filed on March 25, 2004, which is prior to the effective filing date of Vitito (November 8, 2004). Further, the instant application also claims priority to U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/699,334 (filed October 31, 2003), 10/688,611 (filed October 17, 2003) and 10/438,724 (filed May 15, 2003) ("334; '611 and '724 applications"), which were all incorporated by reference in the instant application, and were all filed prior to the U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/517,862 (filed November 7, 2003) ("862 provisional application") to which Vitito claims priority.

Applicant submits that the disclosures of the '334, '611 and '724 applications are sufficient to provide enabling disclosure for at least claims 1 and 26 of the instant application, and/or the disclosure of the '862 provisional application is not sufficient to support a rejection of at least claims 1 and 26.

Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that Vitito is not prior art to the instant application.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Vitito.

Sanders

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, that the docking station comprises at least one slot for receiving a media storage medium, wherein data from the media storage medium is provided to the removable video system via the connector for electrically coupling the docking station to the removable video system.

Claim 26 recites, *inter alia*, that the docking station includes an electrical connector and at least one slot for receiving a media storage medium, wherein the video data from the media storage medium is provided to the video system via the electrical connector.

By way of example, Applicant discloses that docking stations 1203 and 1303 include slots 1264, 1265, 1364 and 1365 for receiving media storage mediums, such as, for example, DVDs, CDs, flash cards, SD cards, SM cards and/or MS cards.

The Examiner maintains that Sanders discloses a slot for receiving a media storage medium at Fig. 9, component 122. However, in stark contrast, element 122 represents connectors for cable, audio, video and power hookups. See Sanders, ¶ 0059. The connectors of Sanders are not slots for receiving media storage mediums.

Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 26 are not anticipated by Sanders. Further, for at least the reason that claims 2-4 and 7-25 depend from claim 1, and claims 27-37 depend from claim 26, claims 2-4, 7-25 and 27-

37 are also submitted not to be anticipated by the cited reference, claims 5 and 6 having been canceled.

As such, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of Sanders.

An early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, the Examiner may telephone Applicant's Attorney to reach a prompt disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael F. Morano
Reg. No. 44,952
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
(516) 692-8888